

Systems Integration Work Group Initial High Level Kentucky Accountability System Design Statements

October 12, 2016

The Systems Integration Work Group met on October 4 and 11, 2016 to consider the accountability system recommendations prepared by the five Work Groups of Educational Innovation, Opportunity and Access, College and Career Readiness, Assessment, and School Improvement. The recommendations included not only some technical “fixes” for the current accountability system, but also more foundational recommendations. These larger recommendations addressed:

- promoting excellence and equity for all students through school accountability,
- incorporating richer indicators of the “whole child” and “whole school,”
- focusing on career, college, and life “future preparation” for all students,
- balancing responsibility for accountability between the state and districts,
- structuring reporting and feedback to promote improvement through cooperation and not just competition or accountability scores/ratings,
- recognizing the varied ways to support better education throughout the state through creating some flexible aspects of accountability, and
- providing more information to inform public reporting and school improvement than just indicators included in state ratings.

This document provides some key initial high level design statements from the Systems Integration Work Group to solicit feedback from the Steering Committee. The Systems Integration Work Group will use comments from the Steering Committee to focus and refine the Systems Integration Work Group’s development of more detailed accountability system recommendations that bring together and extend the various Work Groups’ recommendations. Those more detailed recommendations will be presented for discussion at the Steering Committee’s November 2, 2016 meeting.

Materials discussed at the Systems Integration Work Group’s Oct. 4 and 11 meetings are posted on the KDE website. See <http://education.ky.gov/CommOfEd/adv/Pages/Commissioner%27s-Accountability-Work-Groups.aspx>, or go to www.education.ky.gov and search for “accountability work group.” *Please go to the right side of page under Systems Integration to access individual work group recommendations.*)

1. Kentucky's Educational Accountability System is Focused on Student Opportunity and Success

All students must be provided personalized options, equitable access, and effective supports to achieve high levels of success. Every high school graduate should have the level of preparation needed to successfully proceed to the next step in a chosen path: a degree, credential, certification, apprenticeship, workforce or military ("Postsecondary Readiness").

- All children will have opportunities to learn academic, social, workplace and life knowledge and skills necessary to ensure successful transitions (including Kentucky academic standards).
- Educators support students in developing these knowledge and skills in ways appropriate to the child;
- All shareholders have access to data related to student access, opportunity, and evidence of student learning and school performance.

Strongly
Disagree

Don't feel
Strongly

Strongly
Agree

2. Kentucky's Educational Accountability System Focuses on Indicators of Both Opportunity and Success

To do this, schools will report attainment on a series of leading (inputs) and lagging (outputs/outcomes) indicators (both academic and nonacademic) to report.

Organizing themes include:

- Equitable access
- College and Career Readiness
- Systems of support
- Community and Business Partnership
- Learning environment

Assessment system should be student centered and

- Draws appropriately on multiple measures. A system based on a single assessment is NOT appropriate for all learners or all schools.
- Anchored on preparation of students for successful transition to post-secondary
 - Based on Kentucky standards that incorporate critical thinking skills
 - Measures not only cognitive outputs, but also social and emotional wellness, work and life “essential skills”
- Be supportive of good school systems (e.g., focused on needs of individual students, effective/collaborative school programs)
- Provide some flexibility within districts and schools that allows them to identify values and needs in the community and include in their local measures
- Provide quality evidence that fits purpose and use (not always a test score)
- Attention to time on testing – most efficient use of
 - Through integration of content where appropriate
 - Use of technology (e.g., computer adaptive testing)

Strongly
Disagree

Don't feel
Strongly

Strongly
Agree

3. Kentucky's Educational Accountability System Supports Accountability through both Reporting and Ratings

A strong (aA)ccountability system includes both indicators that are used in

- Reporting
 - broader, deeper evidence
 - flexible for local action and accountability
 - do not want to subject to high pressure accountability
- Reporting and Rating
 - Focal (e.g., for everyone)
 - Subject to quality criteria (e.g., standardized)

Public reporting should be used to incentivize and recognize good practice, rather than penalize bad performance. It is possible to promote best practice standards if the formal accountability stakes are lower, e.g., not attached to formal accountability rating.

Evaluative rating(s) should inform public understanding and support good action and use

- Rating, but not a single numerical score
 - Reduce unproductive competition
- More detail available
 - Should provide useful feedback (e.g., descriptions)

There must be a balance between measures that are technically strong and measures of what is important and valuable.

Strongly
Disagree

Don't feel
Strongly

Strongly
Agree

4. Kentucky's Educational Accountability System will Provide a Fair Means for Identifying Schools for Support

Goal is to identify schools truly in need of support in order to improve, and to provide effective support such that the school can exit support status.

Develop entrance and exit criteria for comprehensive and targeted interventions that support the "lowest performing" schools and the "lowest performing" groups of students. The criteria will allow schools to exit comprehensive or targeted supports when meeting fair exit criteria.

The definitions will at least meet federal requirements (e.g., definition of comprehensive is bottom 5% of schools; graduation rate < 80%; or in Targeted Support for three years without exiting.

Strongly
Disagree

Don't feel
Strongly

Strongly
Agree

5. Kentucky's Educational Accountability System Should Invest in Developing Forward-looking Assessment and Accountability Systems

Promote flexibility in assessment and accountability at the district-level to match curriculum and instructional flexibility.

Create optional pilot assessment system within accountability system of a competency- based system:

- Mutually earned trust between State Educational Agency and Local Educational Agency
- Locally defined competencies based on state content standards with the LEA grouping standards into competencies
- Students demonstrate mastery of competencies through assessments coordinated with competence-based instruction
- Create credibility and evaluate soundness through the pilot where students will take both state assessment and demonstrate mastery locally.
- Assessments are flexible and will be house in a digital assessment bank important to students testing as needed in real time versus during a testing window.

Strongly
Disagree

Don't feel
Strongly

Strongly
Agree